



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION 10
1200 Sixth Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98101

LO

960136

April 23, 1996

Reply To
Attn of: ECO-088

Ref: 95-096-NPS

Superintendent Stephen P. Martin
Denali National Park and Preserve
P.O. Box 9
Denali Park, Alaska 99755

Dear Superintendent Martin:

The Environmental Protection Agency has reviewed the **South Side Denali Revised Draft Development Concept Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (DCP/EIS)** in accordance with our responsibilities under the National Environmental Policy Act and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act.

Based on the information presented in the draft DCP/EIS, our review has not identified any potential environmental impacts that would require substantive changes to the proposal. As a consequence, we are assigning a Lack of Objections (LO) rating to the proposal. Potential activities along the Petersville Road corridor and the development of additional visitor facilities may result in discharges of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States (including wetlands). In such instances, a permit would need to be obtained from the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers (Corp) under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. We recommend that you coordinate with the Corp in the further development of this project.

Enclosed please find a summary of the rating system used in our evaluation of the draft DCP/EIS. Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (206) 553-8561.

Sincerely,

William M. Ryan
Environmental Review Team

Enclosure

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Rating System for
Draft Environmental Impact Statements
Definitions and Follow-Up Action*

Environmental Impact of the Action

LO - - Lack of Objections

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) review has not identified any potential environmental impacts requiring substantive changes to the proposal. The review may have disclosed opportunities for application of mitigation measures that could be accomplished with no more than minor changes to the proposal.

EC - - Environmental Concerns

The EPA review has identified environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment. Corrective measures may require changes to the preferred alternative or application of mitigation measures that can reduce these impacts.

EO - - Environmental Objections

The EPA review has identified significant environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to provide adequate protection for the environment. Corrective measures may require substantial changes to the preferred alternative or consideration of some other project alternative (including the no-action alternative or a new alternative). EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

EU - - Environmentally Unsatisfactory

The EPA review has identified adverse environmental impacts that are of sufficient magnitude that they are unsatisfactory from the standpoint of public health or welfare or environmental quality. EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts. If the potential unsatisfactory impacts are not corrected at the final EIS stage, this proposal will be recommended for referral to the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ).

Adequacy of the Impact Statement

Category 1 - - Adequate

EPA believes the draft EIS adequately sets forth the environmental impact(s) of the preferred alternative and those of the alternatives reasonably available to the project or action. No further analysis of data collection is necessary, but the reviewer may suggest the addition of clarifying language or information.

Category 2 - - Insufficient Information

The draft EIS does not contain sufficient information for EPA to fully assess environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment, or the EPA reviewer has identified new reasonably available alternatives that are within the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which could reduce the environmental impacts of the action. The identified additional information, data, analyses or discussion should be included in the final EIS.

Category 3 - - Inadequate

EPA does not believe that the draft EIS adequately assesses potentially significant environmental impacts of the action, or the EPA reviewer has identified new, reasonably available alternatives that are outside of the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which should be analyzed in order to reduce the potentially significant environmental impacts. EPA believes that the identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussions are of such a magnitude that they should have full public review at a draft stage. EPA does not believe that the draft EIS is adequate for the purposes of the National Environmental Policy Act and or Section 309 review, and thus should be formally revised and made available for public comment in a supplemental or revised draft EIS. On the basis of the potential significant impacts involved, this proposal could be a candidate for referral to the CEQ.

* From EPA Manual 1640 Policy and Procedures for the Review of Federal Actions Impacting the Environment. February, 1987.